DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 899   95   SO 000 112

AUTHOR	Myers, Charles B.
TITLE	Social Studies Innovations 1968-1969; A Report of the Social Studies Pilots of the SPEEDIER Project.
INSTITUTION	Curriculum Study Research and Development Council of South Central Pennsylvania, Palmyra.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	69
GRANT	OEG-3-7-703596-4396
NOTE	67p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.45
DESCRIPTORS	Articulation (Program), Curriculum Development, Curriculum Evaluation, *Demonstration Projects, Diffusion, *Educational Strategies, Information Dissemination, *Inservice Teacher Education, *Instructional Innovation, Models, Pilot Projects, *Social Studies, Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

Five pilot programs were selected as vehicles to introduce new social studies curriculum ideas into the 52 school systems served by the project. The objectives of this ESEA Title III project were: 1) to improve social studies instruction and teacher classroom behavior; 2) to increase local educator understanding of the new curriculum; 3) to develop teacher skills in using new strategies and materials; 4) to develop positive attitudes, educator skills, and knowledge for curriculum experimentation and change; 5) to modify district procedures and policies to promote change. The Fenton Social Science Program and the Greater Cleveland Social Science Program were used in secondary grades. The University of Minnesota Project Social Studies Program, Taba Social Studies Curriculum, Senesh Social Science Program (Our Working World), and the Cleveland Program were used in the elementary grades. Each of these programs and the over-all Pilot Model are described in terms of pilot preparation, implementation, dissemination, and critical evaluation. To determine the success of the pilots, limited assessment procedures were used to measure student critical thinking ability, inquiry skills, value or attitude change, and academic achievement, and to measure teacher values, beliefs and self-concept. SO 000 013 and SO 000 047 are related documents. (SBE)

ED0 40899

SO 000 112

a report of the social studies pilots of the speedier project

SOCIAL STUDIES INNOVATIONS 1968·1969

ED0 40899

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SOCIAL STUDIES INNOVATIONS
1968-1969

A Report of the Social Studies Pilots of the SPEEDIER Project

Charles B. Myers
Social Science Specialist

published by

SPEEDIER Project
101 West Cherry Street
Palmyra, Pennsylvania 17078

December 1969

FORWARD

This publication has been prepared for the school districts of Dauphin, Lancaster, Lebanon, and York counties in Pennsylvania, which are participating in the SPEEDIER Project. Distribution includes other interested educators in the hope that the experiences of the SPEEDIER social studies pilots for 1968-1969 will provide valuable information to other educators in the field.

The report was written by Dr. Charles B. Myers, Social Science Specialist, but is based on the work of all of the SPEEDIER personnel and the participating teachers and administrators. Dr. Kendrick M. McCall, Director of Research, directed the development of the assessment design and the reporting of assessment data. Mrs. Joyce K. Fickes, Information Specialist, and Mr. Edward A. Teichert, Jr., Language Arts Specialist, served as editors; and Mrs. Fickes designed the format and cover. Mrs. Brenda Pavone, Mrs. Mary Caldwell, Mrs. Betsy Fairall, and Mrs. Kathleen Posey handled secretarial and typing chores.

All five social studies pilots described in the report are now in a second year of operation. A preliminary report of these activities for the school year 1969-1970 will be available at the end of March 1970, and a complete report for 1969-1970 will be available after the conclusion of that operational year in July 1970. All evaluation and assessment findings reported here are described in greater detail in a separate publication by Dr. McCall entitled Research Report on Social Studies Pilots -- 1968-1969. These reports will be available upon request from the SPEEDIER Project.

SPEEDIER Staff

1968-1969

Dr. Thomas S. Hamill	Executive Director
Dr. Charles B. Myers	Social Science Specialist
Mr. Edward A. Teichert, Jr.	Language Arts Specialist
Dr. Kendrick M. McCall	Behavioral Scientist
Mr. William Hartman	Group Dynamics Specialist
Mr. George M. Baer	Implementor, Social Studies
Mr. Robert S. Eshelman	Implementor, Social Studies
Mr. William R. Thomas	Implementor, Social Studies
Mr. Charles H. Hostetler	Implementor, Social Studies (part-time)
Miss Susan J. Beede	Implementor, Language Arts
Miss Caroline Sixsmith	Research Assistant
Mrs. Suzette Arnold	Research Assistant

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Purposes of the Pilots 2

General Assumptions. 3

Pilot Programs 5

The Pilot Model. 6

Secondary Pilot Activities 8
    Fenton Program. 8
    Pilot Preparation 11
    Introductory Workshop 12
    Pilot Implementation. 12

Elementary Pilot Activities. 16
    Taba Program. 16
    Minnesota Program 20
    Greater Cleveland Program 21
    Senesh Program. 22
    Pilot Preparation 23
    Introductory Workshop 24
    Pilot Implementation. 25

Assessment Activities. 32
    Student Assessment Procedures 33
    Teacher Assessment Procedures 34
    Assessment Procedures for Fenton Pilot. 35
    Assessment Results for Fenton Pilot 36
    Assessment Procedures for Elementary Pilots 43
    Assessment Results for Elementary Pilots. 46

Conclusions. 52
    Conclusions in Terms of Purposes of the Pilots. 52
    Conclusions about the General Assumptions of the Pilots. 54
    Conclusions Concerning the Pilot Model. 56
    Conclusions Concerning the Five Pilot Programs 58

SOCIAL STUDIES INNOVATIONS -- 1968-1969

Introduction

The SPEEDIER Project (Curriculum Study Research and Development Council of South Central Pennsylvania) is a curriculum project funded under the Elementary Secondary Education Act, Title III. Its activities emphasize the implementation of new curriculum ideas in the schools that the project serves. Its primary purposes are

1. To improve social studies classroom instruction
2. To improve language arts classroom instruction
3. To produce positive change in teacher classroom behavior.

The Project serves the school systems of the four south central Pennsylvania counties of Dauphin, Lancaster, Lebanon, and York. Fifty-two public and private school systems are involved. The Board of Directors of the Project is composed of chief school administrators from the participating districts.

The Project staff functioning during the school year 1968-1969 included eleven full-time professionals and five full-time non-professional employees. The staff organization was as follows:

- Executive Director
- Curriculum or Planning Staff
  - Social Science Specialist
  - Language Arts Specialist
  - Group Dynamics Specialist
  - Director of Research
- Research Staff
  - Director of Research
  - Research Librarian
  - Research Specialist
- Implementation Staff (three curriculum consultants)
- Media Specialist.

The staff members involved directly in the social studies pilots and their primary responsibilities were

Social Science Specialist
  Reviewed social studies programs for piloting
  Was primarily responsible for pilot model, priorities, and procedures
  Coordinated all social studies activities
Research Staff
  Searched for all needed information
  Assessed pilot programs
  Monitored pilot activities
  Supplied miscellaneous support activities
Implementation Staff
  Two of the three men worked directly with pilot teachers as consultants and monitors of pilot implementation
Media Specialist
  Provided general support activities, including the use of audio-visual equipment.

The social studies component of SPEEDIER is involved in three general types of activities:

Full-year pilots
Shorter term implementation projects
Consultant services.

This report is limited to the full-year pilot activities for the first full operational year, 1968-1969.

Purposes of the Pilots

Five social studies pilot programs were selected as vehicles to introduce into the schools served by SPEEDIER the most recent thinking in social studies curriculum. Emphasis was placed on new organizations of content, new teaching strategies, and new materials. The programs selected contain components that SPEEDIER personnel consider significant improvements over the social studies generally taught in the area, but the unqualified adoption of any of the programs was not one of the pilot objectives. The SPEEDIER Project staff expected the pilot endeavor to affect education in the four counties in the following ways:

1. Improve social studies instruction as evaluated by participating teachers, district administrators, SPEEDIER staff, and outside social studies experts

2. Improve teacher classroom behavior as evaluated by the teachers, their administrators, the SPEEDIER staff, and outside social studies experts

3. Increase local educator understanding of the newer content, ideas, and teaching approaches contained in the pilot programs
4. Develop teacher skills in the use of new teaching strategies
5. Develop educator skills in curriculum experimentation
6. Develop in educators a positive attitude toward curriculum experimentation and change
7. Increase educator knowledge about curriculum and curriculum change so the educators would be better prepared to improve the curricula of their own school systems
8. Modify district procedures and policies to enhance the handling and promoting of change.[1]

General Assumptions

Some general assumptions on which the pilots were based are

1. Social studies instruction in the four counties has not kept pace with the newest thinking in social studies education
2. Most teachers and administrators in the area cannot make optimal use of the most recent thinking without help from outside their district
3. It is impractical for the school systems individually or cooperatively to write a new social studies program
4. A series of theoretical presentations to teachers on new social studies topics would not alone produce significant change in the classroom
5. One or two-day in-service programs would be similarly ineffective

---

[1] Specific objectives appropriate to these eight areas were designated for each pilot.

6. Materials that require new approaches to handling content and new teaching strategies in social studies are now available for classroom use

7. These materials can be used as vehicles for up-dating social studies curriculum contents, teaching strategies, and administrative procedures

8. An efficient way to produce change in the classroom is to provide the opportunity for teachers and administrators to work with new programs and to provide enough consultant service to make the experience as profitable and as pleasant as possible

9. Even though pilot programs may be rated very highly by social studies experts and may have been found to be valuable by other school districts, only local school personnel can determine if the program in question serves its own objectives and fits into its own school setting

10. By piloting the programs in their own schools, local teachers and administrators will be able to make a valid assessment of the programs in terms of their own priorities

11. Through the use of pilot programs, school district policies and perceptions will be modified gradually and will become more appropriate for the promoting of needed change

12. Even if a district decides not to continue to use a particular pilot program, the experience of trying it for one year will help improve its existing social studies program, its teacher classroom strategies, and its district policies concerning curriculum innovation

13. After a period of cooperative curriculum experimentation with SPEEDIER, local school districts will be able to conduct their own pilots and to continue curriculum revision.

Pilot Programs

The five social studies pilot programs used were

Program	Grade level for which materials were designed	Grade levels in pilot
Fenton Social Science Program (Holt, Rinehart and Winston)	9 - 10	9 - 12
Greater Cleveland Social Science Program	1 - 9	1 - 8
University of Minnesota Project Social Studies Program	1 - 6*	1 - 5
Taba Social Studies Curriculum	1 - 6**	1,2,3,5,6
Senesh Social Science Program (Science Research Associates--"Our Working World")	1 - 3	1 - 3

The programs were selected for use as pilots

because they have been recommended highly by experts in the field of social studies education

because they incorporate principles and ideas which SPEEDIER staff members believe represent the future trends in social studies education

because they have a rationale consistent with the policies of the local school districts

because they are developed to the extent that teacher work in preparing or searching for materials is at a minimum

because they involve teaching strategies different from those usually used in the classrooms of the area

because they require changes in teacher classroom behavior and

because they seem to be appropriate vehicles for producing significant positive change in a variety of instructional components of the school systems served by SPEEDIER.

---

* The complete Minnesota Program includes grades K-12, but only 1-6 were available when the pilot began.

** The complete Taba Program includes grades 1-8, but only 1-6 were available when the pilot began.

The Pilot Model

The pilot model that was used contains five phases.

Phase I - Climatizing

The climatizing phase of the pilot involves an analysis of local school districts by the SPEEDIER staff in an effort to determine the types of pilot programs that would be most valuable to them at their present stage of development. Once this is decided, the SPEEDIER staff attempts to cultivate within the districts a positive attitude toward curriculum change and a will to undertake the piloting of some new social studies program. Staff members meet with social studies teachers and administrators in formal and informal settings. They discuss needs for change, possible directions, and ways in which SPEEDIER can help.

Phase II - Selection of Program and Establishment of Pilot

While the possibility of change is being discussed with the local school districts, SPEEDIER staff members review recent information concerning new social studies curriculum development projects. They select those specific programs that social studies experts rate highly, that seem to fit the needs of the local schools, and that appear to be appropriate vehicles to produce significant change in the schools. They describe these programs to administrators who indicate an interest in pilot participation. The administrators then decide if their district will participate, to what degree they will participate, and which program or programs they will use.

Phase III - Pilot Operation--First Year

This phase of the pilot contains three stages:

A. Background preparation for the pilot, including the establishment of pilot procedures and scheduling

B. The introductory workshop, usually of three to five days duration

C. Pilot implementation, including classroom use of the program and periodic school-year workshops.

When an administrator plans to have his district participate, an agreement is written between SPEEDIER and the district, specifying the roles of both parties. The district then selects teachers to participate. These teachers attend training sessions and workshops, some of which are scheduled prior to the start of the program (usually in August). Others are held at various times during the school year. The actual scheduling of the meetings during the year is based on the performance and progress of the teachers. Most workshop sessions are conducted for a full day of five and one-half or six hours or for two sessions of two and one-half to three hours.

As the teachers use the program during the year, a SPEEDIER implementation staff member visits their classes, observes their teaching, and consults with them.

In the implementation part of this phase, four different points of emphasis are pursued in a rough sequential pattern.

1. The introduction of pilot materials and the development of teacher familiarity with them

   This usually involves the first six to eight weeks of the pilot.

2. Refinement of teaching techniques in the use of the materials

   The implementation staff member consults with the teachers on an individual basis. Although this stage is emphasized primarily during the third and fourth month of the pilot, there is an effort to maintain the emphasis throughout the school year.

3. Dissemination of information about the pilot program to other teachers within the piloting district and to other districts who are not working with this particular pilot program

4. Critical evaluation of the program and the determination by the district of plans for future use

Phase IV - Pilot Operation--Second Year

Districts that decide to expand the program add more teachers to the pilot, usually at additional grade levels. SPEEDIER continues to work with the new teachers in arrangements similar to the first year, and the consultant continues to visit the classrooms of the new teachers. A variety of arrangements are made between SPEEDIER and each district concerning the role SPEEDIER plays in assisting the teachers who are participating for their second year. The exact role played by SPEEDIER is defined in terms of the district's choices and the degree of progress which the first-year pilot teachers have made. Usually the district, its administrators, and the original pilot teachers assume more responsibility for the pilot.

Phase V - Institutionalization

Districts wishing to adopt some part of the pilot program as a component of their social studies program work with SPEEDIER to adapt the material to their own objectives and priorities. SPEEDIER also assists with the training of the teachers who did not work in the pilots to that point. Gradually the districts assume the entire responsibility for the program. SPEEDIER continues to serve as a consultant and advisory staff to be called upon at the discretion of the district.

All five social studies pilots discussed in this report reached Phase III of the pilot model during 1968-1969. In several districts Phases IV and V have since begun.

SECONDARY PILOT ACTIVITIES

Fenton Program

The Fenton Program was the only program used as a pilot at the secondary level in the 1968-1969 school year. It was originally developed at the Social Studies Curriculum Center of Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, under a grant from the Cooperative Research Branch of the United States Office of Education. The materials used are those of the revised version published as the Holt Social Studies Curriculum by the Holt, Rinehart and Winston

Company. The total Fenton Program consists of seven courses designed to be taught in a sequential manner in grades 9 through 12. The courses at each grade level are as follows:

Grade 9
  Comparative Political Systems
  Comparative Economic Systems

Grade 10
  The Shaping of Western Society
  Tradition and Change in Four Societies

Grade 11
  American History

Grade 12
  Introduction to the Behavioral Sciences
  Humanities in Three Cities.

The components of the program taught in the pilot included only the first four of the seven courses. The other materials were not available when the pilot began.

A total of fifteen teachers in nine school districts were involved in the pilot. A breakdown by district, grade level, and number of teachers and students is reported on Table I.

The Fenton Program combines objectives in four major areas: inquiry skills, knowledge, attitudes, and values. Heavy emphasis is placed on student use of inquiry skills, based on a six step process described by Fenton as "a mode of inquiry." The knowledge or information taught in the program centers around "analytical concepts" drawn from the social sciences. The value objectives are pursued through a method of teaching that involves the analysis of value conflicts by students under teacher direction. The general process for this component of the program is similar to that developed by Donald W. Oliver and his co-workers in the Harvard Social Studies Project. Specific content covered is that which fits the inquiry, conceptual, and value objectives.

TABLE I

Districts Involved in Fenton Program

Districts	Grade Level	Courses* Taught	Number of Sections	Number of Teachers	Number of Pupils
Central Dauphin	9	Eco./Pol. Systems	2	1	73
Central York	10	Western Soc./Four Soc.	4	2	111
Donegal	12	Eco./Pol. Systems	4	1	122
Eastern York	11	Eco./Pol. Systems	2	1	58
Hempfield**	12	Eco./Pol. Systems	2	2	70
Lebanon Catholic***	12	Economic Systems	4	1	145
Palmyra	9	Eco./Pol. Systems	2	2	60
	11	Economic Systems	2	1	66
Spring Grove Area	10	Western Soc./Four Soc.	2	1	40
	12	Eco./Pol. Systems	2	1	60
Lampeter-Strasburg	12	Eco./Pol. Systems	3	2	91
			29	15	896

---

* "Eco. Systems" represents Comparative Economic Systems
"Pol. Systems" represents Comparative Political Systems
"Western Soc./Four Soc." represents The Shaping of Western Society and Tradition and Change in Four Societies

** These teachers were added after the pilot started. They did not attend the initial workshop sessions.

*** Used only during the second semester

Pilot Preparation

The Fenton pilot effort began in early spring 1968 with Dr. Charles B. Myers' analysis of the nature of the new social studies curriculum projects for secondary schools. Dr. Myers and Dr. Thomas S. Hamill discussed the latest reports from project centers throughout the country and decided that the Fenton Program would be most appropriate for SPEEDIER to offer to its participating districts as material for initial pilots. Criteria used in the selection were: the rationale and assumptions of the project, the availability of the materials, the assessed stage of development of the schools in the area, and the willingness of the teachers in the area to accept certain new types of materials and teaching ideas.

On May 15, 1968, a conference was held at which Mitchell P. Lichtenberg of the Social Studies Curriculum Development Center at Carnegie-Mellon University explained the nature of the Fenton Social Studies Program to approximately 90 educators from the districts served by SPEEDIER. Following that meeting, George M. Baer, Curriculum Specialist, and the only SPEEDIER staff member who had joined Dr. Hamill on a full-time basis by that time, contacted all educators who indicated on the conference evaluation form that they wanted more information. Mr. Baer discussed the nature of the Fenton Program in more detail and described the kinds of activities that would be involved in the pilot. Eight school districts indicated they were interested in participating. (A ninth district that began using the Fenton Program on its own decided to affiliate with the SPEEDIER pilot later.)

Mr. Baer and the chief school administrators in the eight districts developed plans for the pilot during the academic year 1968-1969. The administrators selected the teachers and the grade levels that were to be involved in the pilot. The bases for their selection varied. Some of the teachers chosen had indicated dissatisfaction with their current social studies program; others expressed an interest in working with something new, some specifically mentioning the Fenton Program. In a few situations the choice of participating teachers was almost an arbitrary selection that can be described only as the personal choice of the administrator. After Mr. Baer and the school administrator agreed on the process for purchasing materials and other administrative details, an agreement specifying responsibilities was drafted and signed by the school district and SPEEDIER.

Introductory Workshop

On August 26-29, thirteen teachers selected to work with the Fenton pilot attended a four-day workshop. (Two other teachers were added later.) During these four days the nature of the SPEEDIER Project, the purposes and activities of the pilot, and the nature of the Fenton Social Studies Program were explained. During the first day, Lewis N. Shaten, social studies teacher and department chairman at Elkins Park Junior High School, Cheltenham (Pennsylvania) School District, demonstrated one of the Fenton lessons. Following the demonstration, the teachers analyzed Mr. Shaten's presentation and discussed in detail the techniques and strategies involved in inquiry teaching as suggested in the Fenton Program. On the second day a similar discussion and analysis was pursued, based on a film of Dr. Fenton teaching a group of high school students.

On the third day, Dr. Kendrick McCall of the SPEEDIER staff introduced the teachers to a modified form of the Flanders Interaction Analysis System. The teachers then worked with the system in analyzing the video-tape of Mr. Shaten's lesson and the Fenton film. On the fourth day, one of the teachers of the group prepared a lesson and taught it to the others. The presentation was replayed on video-tape and analyzed by all of the participants.

Pilot Implementation -- George M. Baer, Implementation Director

Introduction of Materials

Many of the teachers began to use the Fenton materials at the start of the school year as planned. A few had to delay the beginning of the pilot because the Holt, Rinehart and Winston Company was late in supplying materials to the districts. All of the schools did have the pilot under way before the end of September. Where there was a delay, teachers taught some of the material they had used the previous year or taught about the up-coming presidential election. A few worked with experimental unit samples that were developed a year earlier by Holt.

From the beginning of the classroom work until November 13, when the first follow-up workshop was held, the teachers concentrated on becoming familiar with the program, establishing a pattern in working with it, and helping students adjust to the new learning climate.

On November 13, the teachers met with Mr. Baer, Dr. Myers, and Dr. McCall. They reported some of the problems involved in the implementation process, emphasizing some administrative and procedural difficulties. Time was also devoted to discussions of specific teachers' experiences and of the modifications they had made in the teaching strategies outlined in the teaching guide. They reported on the results of teaching the lessons as designed and on the modifications they had undertaken. Concern was voiced for a closer analysis of the questioning technique involved in Fenton's directed discussion. This topic had been planned for the session but, because the teachers chose to devote more time to sharing and analyzing their own teaching experiences, it was postponed until the following meeting.

Refinement of Teaching Techniques

After the November 13 meeting, the teachers concentrated on refining their teaching skills in directed discussion, inquiry, and value clarification as called for in the Fenton Program. Classroom observations by Mr. Baer provided feedback for teacher self-analysis.

A workshop on February 7 focused on the teaching techniques of the Fenton Program. The teachers discussed the weaknesses and strengths of the materials based on their experiences to that date. They described classroom techniques they had found valuable, reported on student reaction to the program, and suggested ways in which the material could be adapted to meet even better the needs of their particular students. They analyzed a demonstration film of a value clarification lesson taught by Fenton and listened to a presentation on the Bloom taxonomy of cognitive skill objectives. Each teacher was also given a copy of Norris Sanders' Classroom Questions: What Kind?[2] for use in analyzing his own classroom questioning technique. Mr. Baer discussed the Sanders book with individual teachers during his subsequent visits.

---

[2] Norris Sanders, Classroom Questions: What Kind? (Harper and Row: New York, 1966).

Dr. McCall met with each teacher individually during the meeting to compare the results of the analysis of the audio-tape recording of one of his classes with the Self-perception Inventory administered at the start of the pilots. The teachers drew their own conclusions from the comparison and matched them with the strategies suggested by the Fenton Program.

Dissemination

Arrangements for the dissemination of information for all the pilots began in early February. Pilot teachers and their principals were asked to select one day a week when visitors from the other school districts in the four counties could observe the pilot classes. This information was sent to all chief school administrators with an explanation of the procedure by which visits could be arranged. Visits began February 17 and continued until March 8. The purpose of the visits was to enable non-pilot educators to see the programs being taught and to talk with the pilot teachers so they could determine for themselves the degree to which they would be involved in pilots the following year.

In addition to the in-class observations, pilot information sessions were scheduled, where pilot objectives and procedures, and the nature of each of the five pilot programs were explained. Some videotapes were also preserved, with the approval of the teachers, for viewing by school representatives contemplating adding pilots.

Critical Evaluation

The final phase of the pilot began in March and consisted of a critical analysis of the program, its materials, and its teaching strategies. The analysis was calculated to enable districts to determine their future course of action. A workshop was held on May 5 concentrating on this analysis. Original plans called for the use of the Curriculum Analysis System developed by the Social Science Education Consortium; but, because of the limited amount of time and the limited degree of sophistication of the teachers and districts, the plans were modified. As a result, the analysis involved only a discussion-type review by the teachers of the Fenton Program and of their use of it. Each teacher decided if he wanted to continue using it and if he wanted to recommend its expanded use in his district.

Of the fifteen teachers who worked with the Fenton Program, thirteen planned to continue using it as a central part of their social studies classes the following year. One of the two teachers who chose to return to more traditional social studies was teaching Comparative Economic Systems to average and below average eleventh-grade students. He felt that his students were unable to handle Comparative Economic Systems because of their limited reading abilities and because of their general unwillingness to participate in class discussion. He did plan, however, to keep the Fenton materials and to use certain sections as supplements on a unit basis.

The second teacher who chose not to work with the program was teaching Comparative Economic Systems and Comparative Political Systems in grade nine. As his reason for not continuing, he stated that the Fenton Program did not match his teaching style. He indicated a desire to keep the Fenton materials for use as supplements to his more traditional social studies. However, his district chose to give the materials to another teacher who had indicated interest in using them in the 1969-1970 school year.

Of the thirteen teachers who had planned to continue using the program during the 1969-1970 school year, three changed teaching positions during the summer. Of the ten remaining teachers, most added classes to the program. All expressed a desire to modify the program by deleting some lessons, changing others, and adding other material of their own choosing.

Two of the districts using the material added new teachers to the pilot. Spring Grove added three teachers, one as a replacement for a teacher who left the system and two who began using the newer materials for grades eleven and twelve. Lampeter-Strasburg added a teacher for the tenth-grade materials to the two who were using the ninth-grade courses. Three other districts selected new teachers as replacements, two replaced teachers who had left the systems and the other replaced one of the teachers who chose not to continue with the program. In all three cases, the districts chose to handle the implementation without direct contact with SPEEDIER, but all three teachers have since asked for and received SPEEDIER aid.[3]

---

[3] Because of the nationwide cut in ESEA Title III funds for the 1969-1970 school year, SPEEDIER began charging each district $50 per teacher for pilot participation. The charge represents about one-fourth of SPEEDIER's cost for pilot operation. The charge was a factor in the districts' decisions. All of the districts have since reversed their decisions, and their new teachers are beginning to work in the pilot for 1969-1970.

ELEMENTARY PILOT ACTIVITIES

Elementary programs developed by four separate social studies curriculum projects were used in eighteen school districts by fifty-seven participating teachers. Grades one through eight were included. A breakdown by district, grade level, number of teachers, and number of students is reported on Table II.

The programs used were

1. the Taba Social Studies Curriculum
2. the University of Minnesota Project Social Studies Program
3. the Greater Cleveland Social Science Program
4. the Senesh Social Science Program, published by SRA.

A fifth program entitled Man, A Course of Study, developed by the Education Development Center, was also selected but had to be dropped for 1968-1969 because the materials were not available for piloting since SPEEDIER became operative after the in-service training workshops had been scheduled by EDC. At that time, EDC did not permit in-service training by anyone other than a person who had been trained by their own staff and through their own program.

Taba Program

The Taba Social Studies Curriculum was originally developed under the direction of Dr. Hilda Taba in conjunction with the Contra Costa County (California) Schools. Later, Dr. Taba received a grant from the Cooperative Research Branch of the United States Office of Education to continue and expand the development of the curriculum. The funded project was entitled "Development of a Comprehensive Curriculum Model for Social Studies, Grades 1 through 8, Inclusive of Procedures for Implementation and Dissemination." After Dr. Taba's death, the project was continued by Norman E. Wallen, Mary C. Durkin, and Jack R. Fraenkel.

The curriculum includes materials for grades one through eight and is designed to enable students to acquire thinking skills, key concepts and major generalizations, selected attitudes, and academic and social skills. Heavy emphasis is placed on thinking skills,

TABLE II

Districts Involved in Elementary Pilots

District	Grade Level	Number of Teachers	Number of Pupils
TABA			
Annville-Cleona	6	2	57
Donegal	1	1	22
	5	2	54
Ephrata	1	1	24
Hempfield	3	2	56
Lampeter-Strasburg	1	2	49
	2	2	52
	5	2	50
Lancaster City	3	2	42
Spring Grove Area	6	1	31
		17	437
MINNESOTA			
Annville-Cleona	5	2	54
Cocalico	1	1	5
	2	1	29
	3	1	21
	4	1	33
Derry Township	1	2	42
Donegal	1	2	63
Palmyra	3	2	54
	4	2	58
Spring Grove Area	5	1	29
		15	408

TABLE II (continued)

District	Grade Level	Number of Teachers	Number of Pupils
GREATER CLEVELAND			
Derry Township	1	2	43
Eastern Lebanon County	2	2	60
	4	2	46
	8	1	88
Northeastern	5	2	63
	6	2	67
	7	1	104
Solanco	3	3	77
Spring Grove Area	4	1	25
		16	573
SENESH			
Central Dauphin	1	1	28
	2	1	30
	3	1	29
Hempfield	2	1	31
Lancaster Township	2	1	20
Spring Grove Area	1	1	28
Susquehanna Township	2	3	68
		9	234
TOTAL OF ALL ELEMENTARY PILOTS		57	1652

which are separated into four thinking tasks: concept formation, interpretation of data, application of generalizations, and interpretation of feelings and attitudes. The program incorporates concepts and generalizations from the social sciences in an integrated fashion. Selected concepts provide continuity by serving as strands through all eight years of the program and major generalizations provide the organizing themes for each unit.

The curriculum requires a concentrated in-service program, the model for which was developed by the Taba Curriculum Center and the Institute for Staff Development. A greatly modified and shortened form of that model was used in the pilot.

The topics covered at each grade level of the program are as follows:

Grade 1:	The Family
Grade 2:	The Community
Grade 3:	A Study of Comparative Communities
Grade 4:	California - Yesterday and Today
Grade 5:	A History of the United States and Its Relationships with Canada
Grade 6:	Selected Ways of Life in Latin America
Grade 7:	Key Elements in the Growth and Development of Western Civilization
Grade 8:	The Growth of the American Nation

During 1968-1969, SPEEDIER worked with grades 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6.

Materials used in the pilot include teaching guides and a Teacher's Handbook for Elementary Social Studies written by Dr. Taba, which describes some of the theory behind the program.[4] Because the in-service training was condensed from the model developed by the Institute for Staff Development, manuals for teacher use on each of the four thinking tasks were not used. The teaching guides call for the use of a variety of reading and audio-visual materials for students. These were ordered by SPEEDIER and provided to the participating teachers. In most cases, two pilot teachers shared one set of materials. There is no common text.

---

[4] Hilda Taba, Teacher's Handbook for Elementary Social Studies (Addison-Wesley: Palo Alto, California, 1967).

Minnesota Program

The University of Minnesota Project Social Studies Program was developed by Dr. Edith West under a grant from the Cooperative Research Branch of the United States Office of Education. The project was entitled "Preparation and Evaluation of Curriculum Guides and Sample Pupil Materials for Social Studies in Grades K-14." However, materials were only developed for grades K-12.

The program centers on culture and is a sequential interdisciplinary social studies program developed around key concepts, generalizations, skills, and attitudinal behaviors. Unit by unit and grade by grade continuity is stressed. The content taught at each grade level is as follows:

Grade 1: Families Around the World
Grade 2: Families Around the World
Grade 3: Communities Around the World
Grade 4: Communities Around the World
Grade 5: Regional Studies
Grade 6: The Formation of American Society
Grade 7: Man and Society
Grade 8: Our Political System
Grade 9: Our Economic System and Socio-Economic Problems
Grade 10: American History--Development of American Civilization
Grade 11: Area Studies
Grade 12: Value Conflicts and Policy Decisions

SPEEDIER pilots for 1968-1969 used the materials for grades one through five.

Materials for the Minnesota Program include teacher resource units plus a few mimeographed student materials. The major portion of the student materials used in the program are a variety of reading and audio-visual components listed in the teaching guides. SPEEDIER provided the resource units to the teachers, who then selected the activities that they felt were most appropriate for their own class. The Project also supplied sets of student materials to the piloting teachers, who in most cases shared them with one other person working at the same grade level in the same building. Valuable assistance in selecting and securing needed student materials was provided by Charles L. Mitsakos, Social Studies Curriculum Coordinator, Chelmsford, Massachusetts.

Greater Cleveland Program

The Greater Cleveland Social Science Program was developed by the Educational Research Council of Greater Cleveland, now the Educational Research Council of America. The Council began operation in 1959 with the purpose of improving elementary and secondary school curricula in northeast Ohio. It began work on social studies in 1961. To date, it has produced revised social studies curriculum materials for grades one through nine. The program involves teaching concepts rather than facts, integrated learning of concepts selected from the different social science disciplines, and cumulative learning by which instruction at each grade level is built carefully upon that of the preceding grades.

The materials include teaching guides and student textbooks for each unit. There are more than sixty different student texts for grades K through 9.

The instruction topics for each grade level are as follows:

Kindergarten: Learning About the World; Children in Other Lands
Grade 1: Our Country; Explorers and Discoverers
Grade 2: Communities at Home and Abroad
Grade 3: The Making of Anglo-America; The Metropolitan Community
Grade 4: The Story of Agriculture; The Story of Industry; India
Grade 5: The Human Adventure, Parts I, II, III, and IV; The Middle East
Grade 6: The Human Adventure, Parts V, VI, VII, and VIII; Latin America
Grade 7: The Challenges of Our Time, Parts I, II, III, and IV; Principles of Geography; Africa
Grade 8: Six Generations of Americans; North America and the Caribbean
Grade 9: The Price of Freedom; Western and Eastern Europe

In 1968-1969, SPEEDIER piloted the program in grades one through eight.

Senesh Program

The Senesh Program was developed originally as part of the Elkhart, Indiana Experiment in Economic Education under the directorship of Dr. Lawrence Senesh. It is based on the principle that social studies facts can be understandable if fundamental problems or principles that underly these facts can be taught to the students. The program itself emphasizes "why" questions that students raise concerning the social studies material they study. It is heavily based on principles of economics although other social science disciplines are included.

Dr. Senesh is planning the program for grades one through six, but only materials for grades 1, 2, and 3 have been completed. These are published by Science Research Associates. The topics taught in each grade are:

Grade 1: Families at Work
Grade 2: Neighbors at Work
Grade 3: Cities at Work

The materials used for the program include a student text, an activity book for students, and a teacher's resource guide. A set of records is also available for grades 1 and 2. SPEEDIER piloted the material at all three primary grades.

Pilot Preparation

During the summer of 1968, members of the SPEEDIER staff reviewed reports of different curriculum development projects in social studies in an effort to identify the programs which would be most valuable and most appropriate for use by the elementary schools in our area. Dr. Charles B. Myers, Dr. Thomas S. Hamill, Geroge M. Baer, and William R. Thomas participated in the endeavor with the assistance of Research Librarian, Caroline Sixsmith. Some of the criteria used to determine which project materials would be selected for use were the rationale and assumptions of the project, the availability of the materials, the assessed stage of development of the schools in the area, and the willingness on the part of the teachers of the area to accept certain new types of materials and teaching ideas.

As soon as the five social studies programs were identified, a short description of them was sent to all chief school administrators of the SPEEDIER area. The administrators who were interested in more information on any one or all of the programs were asked to respond on an enclosed postcard. Where there was a positive response, a member of the SPEEDIER staff visited the school administrator, and in most cases some of his staff, and described the programs in as much detail as possible. Descriptive printed material was also given to the people at that time.

After the administrators analyzed the information, they were asked to make a choice of pilot or pilots they would like to pursue. SPEEDIER suggested that at least two teachers using the same materials at the same grade level in the same school be selected so they would be able to communicate with and assist each other. It was also hoped that there would be enough teachers involved to assess the programs adequately, but not so many that the district would be committed to a program before its own people had an opportunity for a thorough analysis. SPEEDIER did not want the school districts to be bound to a particular set of materials until the district staffs were able to conclude what the materials could and could not do.

August 22, 1968, was set as the deadline by which all chief school administrators were to have decided their course of action; but many administrators were not able to make a decision by that time, causing a delay in the original plan. It was about September 10, before most districts had made a choice.

Eventually eighteen districts did choose to pilot one or more of the elementary programs. As soon as this decision was made, SPEEDIER staff members wrote agreements with the individual districts to define the exact commitments SPEEDIER and the districts were making for the academic year.

Introductory Workshop

A three-day workshop for all pilot teachers was conducted September 19-21. For the first day, all area elementary school principals, district superintendents, curriculum personnel, and additional respresentatives selected by superintendents were invited. About 150 people attended. The session consisted of general presentations on the new social studies, including trends, unique ideas, and possible directions for the school districts represented. Principal speakers were Raymond English, Program Director, Greater Cleveland Social Science Program; and Dr. Charles B. Myers. During the afternoon, separate half-hour presentations on each of the four pilot programs were given by SPEEDIER staff members. Approximately thirty-five persons attended each on a sequential basis so that everyone had an opportunity to attend all four sessions and to ask questions concerning each program.

The meetings on the following two days were designed as training sessions and were restricted to the fifty-seven teachers who were to be involved in the pilots. The sessions were conducted jointly by SPEEDIER staff members and outside consultants who had been working with the various programs. For the Greater Cleveland Program, Miss Delores Beck from the Educational Research Council of Greater Cleveland worked with William R. Thomas. For the Minnesota Program, Charles L. Mitsakos, Social Studies Curriculum Coordinator for Chelmsford, Massachusetts, worked with Dr. Charles B. Myers. For the Taba Program, Basil Kakavas, coordinator of the implementation program for the Taba curriculum in Park Forest, Illinois, worked with George M. Baer and Dr. Kendrick M. McCall. For the Senesh Program, Donald Markle, the SRA area representative, and Mrs. Patricia Saxton, a teacher from the neighboring school district of East Pennsboro, worked with Robert Eshelman. During the two days, all four programs were explained in detail and demonstrated. Much time was devoted to actual practice with the materials by the teachers.

Pilot Implementation

Introduction of Materials

The introduction of materials for all four elementary pilots followed the same general pattern, but the nature of the programs and the availability of materials at the start of the year did dictate some variations in the procedure used for each pilot. In general, the materials were ordered by SPEEDIER, organized by SPEEDIER if necessary, and given to the teachers. After the teachers began working with the materials in the classroom, they met individually with the Implementation Director assigned by SPEEDIER to their program. For six weeks to two months after the teachers began using the program in the classroom, the consultant concentrated on helping them become familiar with the program and its materials. In most cases this involved classroom visitations by the consultant. In a few cases, grade-level meetings were also scheduled. Variations in handling this first part of the pilot implementation for each of the four programs are described below.

Taba -- George M. Baer, Implementation Director

The implementation of the Taba Program was delayed until late October because many companion materials ordered individually by SPEEDIER did not arrive until that time. However, since the main emphasis of the Taba Program is on teaching strategies, many teachers did practice the strategies they learned in the initial workshop almost immediately, using them with their traditional content. When the materials arrived, they were organized and labeled by SPEEDIER and turned over to the teachers at a dinner meeting scheduled during the last week in October. At that meeting, the list of materials in the teaching guides were marked as "available" and "not available" for use at that time. The teachers put the materials to use within the next few days, and Mr. Baer consulted with them individually during the succeeding weeks.

The materials problem was caused by a combination of situations. The Taba curriculum employs a large variety of materials which have to be ordered from many different publishers, labeled, and packaged for teacher use. Orders for these materials were placed very late because decisions to pilot elementary programs were not made by most districts until late August and early September. A number of the items suggested in the teacher guides were no longer in print or readily available. Because of the delay, a new procedure for handling materials orders was developed for 1969-1970, and a longer lead time for ordering was planned.

Minnesota -- William R. Thomas, Implementation Director

The pilot of the University of Minnesota Project Social Studies Program was also delayed until late October because of the need for companion materials. The problems and the steps followed in handling them were identical to those described for the Taba Program. Because the Minnesota guides emphasize the reorganization of content according to concepts and generalizations, however, teachers were less able than those in the Taba Program to begin some classroom innovation without the new material. Most teachers did begin with the pilot soon after receiving the materials during the last week in October. Mr. Thomas consulted individually with the teachers during the succeeding weeks.

Greater Cleveland -- William R. Thomas, Implementation Director

Immediately following the introductory workshop, the Greater Cleveland teachers began using the new materials in their classrooms. Mr. Thomas worked with the teachers individually and in small groups on a consulting basis. Although the program required changes in content and teaching strategies, most teachers adjusted quickly. The rather complete teacher's guide, the fact that the program is content oriented, and the fact that each student had a text helped make the transition easier than was the case for the Taba and Minnesota Programs.

Senesh -- Robert Eshelman and Charles Hostetler, Implementation Directors

All Senesh materials were on hand at the time of the introductory workshop, and teachers were able to begin immediately. Mr. Eshelman served as consultant to the teachers, meeting with them in their schools. Several teachers proceeded with little difficulty. Three teachers, however, who were assigned the program without their consent and who attended the Saturday workshop without compensation, avoided using the program on a consistent basis for most of the first month of the pilot. After several meetings with Mr. Eshelman, they agreed to participate more actively.

Refinement of Teaching Strategies

The refinement of teaching strategies for all four elementary pilots began approximately six weeks after the materials were introduced into the classroom. For Greater Cleveland and Senesh this occurred in late October and early November. For the Taba and Minnesota pilots it occurred in early December. A description of the activities involved in the refinement stage for each of the pilots appears below.

Taba

Because the Taba Program involves unique teaching strategies, this portion of the pilot was emphasized more than in the other programs. Although only five workshop days were originally planned, four more full-day sessions were added. Eight of the sessions were conducted by Taba specialists. At each, specific teaching strategies were explained, analyzed, and discussed. Meetings were held on December 2 and 3 under the direction of Dr. Jack Fraenkel, Associate Director of the Taba Curriculum Development Project, and on February 17 and 18 and March 20 and 21 by Basil Kakavas, the director of the introductory Taba workshop in October. At the last two sessions demonstration lessons, using first and fifth grade students, were presented and analyzed.

Mr. Baer observed the Taba classes frequently. His observations plus selective classroom use of audio and video tapings supplied the teachers with feedback information for their own self-analysis.

Minnesota

The emphasis on refining teaching strategies began with separate meetings held on December 11 and 12 for teachers of grades 1, 2, and 3; and for grades 4 and 5 respectively. Discussions centered on teacher experiences with the program to that time, the state of the materials supply, and the procedure to be followed for remaining materials orders. Many items to be used in units for the rest of the year were given to the teachers, itemized in the teaching guides, and labeled for easy teacher use.

Soon after the meeting, all the teachers began the second unit for the year, and Mr. Thomas met with them individually and in grade-level groups to discuss their plans. In these meetings, he emphasized refined use of teaching strategies called for in the guides. The nature of instructional objectives and their use in the teaching of concepts, generalizations, skills, and attitudes was discussed; and the flexible use of the resource guides was explained. Observations by Mr. Thomas and selected classroom use of audio and video tapings provided feedback for teacher self-analysis.

Greater Cleveland

As soon as individual teachers began to feel comfortable with the Greater Cleveland Program, emphasis was placed on the refinement of the teaching strategies that could be used with the program. Classroom observation by Mr. Thomas plus selected audio and video taping of classes provided feedback for teacher self-analysis. A workshop on February 7, 1969, under the direction of James Langer of the Greater Cleveland Social Science staff, focused on the goals, rationale, and conceptual organization of the Greater Cleveland Program. The teachers also discussed their experiences with the program to that date and analyzed the materials they would use during the second half of the year.

Senesh

As soon as the individual teachers adjusted to using the new materials, emphasis was placed on the refinement of teaching strategies suggested in the Senesh guide. Mr. Eshelman's class observations provided feedback for teacher self-analysis. Because a few teachers seemed quite apprehensive about the presence of a classroom observer and because of the original reluctance of some of them to use the materials consistently, Mr. Eshelman was very cautious in his suggestions. As a result, several teachers made less progress in using new teaching strategies than had been hoped. Since other Senesh teachers showed significant progress in the same period of time, however, the slow development by these teachers should not be attributed to the Senesh Program or materials.

A workshop on February 13, led by Mr. Eshelman and Dr. Myers, included a discussion of the experience the teachers had to that point, an analysis of the materials and teaching strategies of the program, and a presentation on the nature of instructional objectives and their use in teaching the Senesh Program. Dr. McCall also discussed with each teacher the results of the analysis of the audio tape of her class.

Dissemination

The dissemination activities for the elementary pilots were the same as those for the Fenton pilot. They are described in the Fenton section of this report.

Critical Evaluation

The final point of emphasis for each pilot consisted of a critical analysis of the programs, teaching strategies, and materials. In each case, this began in March. Its purpose was to enable districts to determine their course of action for the next year. Unlike in the Fenton pilot, no workshops devoted to this task were scheduled. The assessment consisted of discussions between the pilot teachers and the SPEEDIER implementation staff member assigned to the program. No specific analysis instrument was used. The possible use of the Curriculum Analysis System developed by the Social Science Education Consortium was considered, but the SPEEDIER staff felt the degree of teacher sophistication and the amount of time available for meetings made its use undesirable at that time.

Taba

The critical analysis of the teaching strategies and materials of the Taba Program began in March and overlapped the final sessions devoted to teacher training in Taba classroom strategies. Because the meetings were on teaching strategies rather than program evaluation, Mr. Baer met with the teachers individually and in small groups to make the assessment. All the teachers said they were pleased with the program even though it required time for them to adjust to the new teaching strategies, to the lack of a student text, and to the wide variety of companion materials. They indicated that the specific and rather rigid teacher's guide provided a means of security during the adjustment period.

All seventeen teachers who used the Taba strategies and materials during the year planned to continue with them in 1969-1970 and recommended that more teachers in their districts be added. (One teacher of the original eighteen had dropped out of the pilot because of illness before work in the classroom began.) However, four of the seventeen did not continue to teach in their systems the following year.

Five of the seven districts added more teachers. Hempfield expanded the pilot to include all eighteen teachers of one building; Annville-Cleona added eight teachers; Ephrata added six; Lampeter-Strasburg added four (two were replacements for people who left the system); and Spring Grove added a second teacher. The districts that did not expand cited financial problems and other internal difficulties unrelated to the pilot as reasons for not expanding at that time. In all districts, the teachers who started in the pilot continued.

In addition, Penn Manor School District, which did not have teachers in the pilot in 1968-1969, began a pilot for 1969-1970 that involved all twelve teachers of one building. Two other districts outside the SPEEDIER four-county area sent visitors to the pilot schools and signed special agreements for full-school pilots for 1969-1970. Wilkes-Barre Schools included eighteen teachers and Tarrytown, New York included thirteen teachers. The entire cost of these two pilots was borne by the districts.

Minnesota

The Minnesota teachers met with Mr. Thomas individually and in grade-level groups to assess the program. He felt that a full-day meeting originally planned for this purpose was unnecessary.

In general, the teachers felt the program was an improvement over their traditional social studies. However, they did point out that the very flexible teacher's resource guide, the lack of a common student text, and the large variety of companion materials required a period of adjustment. They also pointed out, and the SPEEDIER staff agreed, that the amount of in-service training on the newer teaching strategies employed by the program should have been greater.

Although the teaching strategies required by the Minnesota Program are, in general, less demanding than those of the Taba Program, several in-service sessions devoted directly to newer teaching strategies would have been valuable. The Minnesota teacher's guides do not describe teaching strategies thoroughly enough for the teachers to follow without additional direction.

Thirteen of the fifteen Minnesota pilot teachers chose to continue using the program. The two who did not continue teach in Derry Township where the Greater Cleveland Program was selected for all classes on their grade level. Two districts added more teachers to the pilot for 1969-1970. Cocalico School District has adopted the program for all 32 primary classes in the system (including kindergarten) and plans to add all intermediate grades in 1970-1971. Annville-Cleona School District added three more teachers at grade five.

Greater Cleveland

Mr. Thomas met with Greater Cleveland teachers individually and in small groups to help them assess the value of the program. He chose not to use a full-day workshop session that had been written into the agreements with the districts.

All Greater Cleveland teachers chose to continue using the program for 1969-1970, and three of the five districts expanded the pilot considerably. Eastern Lebanon County School District extended it to include all primary grades in their system plus all fourth, fifth, and sixth grade classes in one of their six elementary schools. Northeastern School District added teachers at various levels and developed a direct relationship with the Educational Research Council for in-service work for 1969-1970. Derry Township Schools included all first and second grade teachers in their expansion.

In the other two districts the decision not to expand was not based on a negative reaction to the program. Solanco had adopted Greater Cleveland earlier and their participating teachers were new to the district and to the program in 1968-1969. For 1969-1970 they planned to handle additional in-service training on their own. Spring Grove had only one teacher in the program and chose to continue it at the same level for another year for a more thorough analysis.

Senesh

The final phase of the Senesh pilot was under the direction of Charles Hostetler, who replaced Mr. Eshelman as Senesh pilot Implementation Director on March 1. He worked with the Senesh teachers individually and in small groups to assess the value of the program. One meeting of all the teachers was held, but only part of it was devoted to analyzing the program.

Four of the nine teachers who used the program continued with it for the 1969-1970 year. Three chose not to continue using it, one stopped teaching, and one taught in a school that selected the Taba Program for school-wide use. One district added new pilot teachers and a second planned to do so but budget cuts postponed the expansion for 1969-1970.

In the district where the three teachers chose not to continue, other teachers were given the materials to use in 1969-1970. In the opinion of the SPEEDIER staff, the Senesh Program itself was not responsible for the discontinued use. Problems within the system, such as teachers remuneration for Saturday meetings, personality clashes, and teacher anxieties about classroom observers were responsible for a negative attitude toward the pilot almost from the start.

ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES

The purposes of the social studies pilots as listed on pages two and three of this report fall into three categories:

1. The improvement of social studies instruction
2. The change of teacher behavior in the classroom and in the role of curriculum innovator
3. The change of district procedure and policy toward curriculum change.

In order to help determine the success of the pilots in these areas, limited assessment procedures were used. Since the primary objective of the pilots was to introduce as many educators as possible to new social studies curriculum ideas and to a process of curriculum change, decisions were often made to add teachers and modify the research design if such modifications would expand the impact of the pilots in the schools of the area. In some cases these modifications clouded the assessment results.

To a great extent, determination of the impact of the pilots was based on the subjective assessment by district personnel and the SPEEDIER staff of changes that the pilots produced in the areas described by the eight pilot objectives. In addition, several more objective instruments were used to help determine the impact of both the pilot programs and the pilot procedure on student and teacher classroom performance. The use of these instruments for each pilot is described below.

Because SPEEDIER became operational during the summer of 1968 and the initial workshops were held before school started in September or at the very start of school, no pre-tests were given before the first workshops.

Student Assessment Procedures

Student assessment procedures followed a standard pre-test, post-test design. The same tests were given pre and post to the experimental group as well as to a selected control group. Score changes between the pre-test and post-test for the experimental students were compared with score changes for the controls. The analysis followed appropriate statistical procedures using the change scores as the criteria for measurement.

Because the initial workshops for teachers in the pilots were held before or at the start of the new school year, the pre-tests were given after the workshops were held. Because the tests had to be given to students from a variety of schools, the actual date of the pre-test varied from group to group and in some cases occurred three or four weeks after the pilot program was begun in the classroom.

The actual selection of testing instruments raised two problems. Since the objectives of the experimental programs were different from those of the more traditional social studies courses, it was difficult to select instruments that would favor neither the experimental group nor the controls. Traditionally designed instruments would favor the traditional programs, and instruments designed specifically to fit the pilot programs would favor the experimentals. At the same time, the more traditional type test would be more valuable in assessing the comparison between experimentals and controls in terms of the content and skills traditionally expected of a social studies program, but it would be less valuable in assessing the degree to which each one of the pilot programs met the specific objectives stated in its rationale.

After considering the situation, the SPEEDIER staff decided to use traditional assessment instruments that purported to assess student abilities in the general areas identified in the stated objectives of the pilot programs. It was recognized that such a choice might give a slight advantage to the controls, and it would not evaluate the experimental programs in terms of their own objectives.

Teacher Assessment Procedures

The teachers involved in the pilots were monitored. They were asked to respond to questions on three inventories at the start of the pilots (but after the first workshop) and near the end of the pilots.

1. The Survey of Interpersonal Values published by Science Research Associates. Pre- and post-test scores were compared to determine if any change occurred.
2. The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale (40-item form), which purports to measure the degree of openmindedness of an individual's belief system. Change scores were examined.
3. The Self-perception Inventory (14-item form) This instrument is quantitative and asks the teacher to personally assess the amount of time he thinks he spends during a class period in various types of oral interaction.

Each teacher was asked to audio tape two hours of his lessons. The tapes were analyzed by a trained coder, who categorized the verbal interaction, using categories similar to those of the Flanders Interaction Analysis System. The categories were the same as those the teachers were asked about on the Self-perception Inventory. Taping was done both pre and post. Changes were noted and analyzed for any significant differences between experimental and control groups. Comparisons were made between the awareness of the teachers concerning their observed verbal interaction patterns, both pre and post. The audio taping was used as a means of assessing change of teacher classroom behavior but not as a tool to facilitate the change of teacher behavior or the refinement of teaching techniques.

Assessment Procedures for Fenton Pilot

The schools and teachers involved in the Fenton pilot were purposely selected by administrators who were interested in making modifications in social studies. Neither district participation nor teacher selection within the districts occurred randomly. When the administrators elected to participate in the pilot, they selected teachers who had previously expressed interest in trying something new or who were recognized as leaders or innovators. In most cases the participating students were those already assigned to the teachers selected. There was a conscious effort to limit participation to average and above average students, although one group of students was classified as average-to-below-average.

The control groups were obtained by matching experimental schools with schools from similar areas. Since there was a conscious effort to expand the pilot within each pilot school, controls within those buildings had to be avoided. Some of the factors utilized for matching schools were the type of community and the size of the student population of the school. Members of the SPEEDIER staff who had extensive knowledge of the four-county area helped with the identification. When the schools were identified, classes and teachers were selected so that course content, grade level, and type of ability groupings were similar to that of the Fenton experimental group. For example, the grade ten experimental groups were matched with control groups in World Cultures courses. The students in Comparative Political

Systems were matched with students in either Problems of Democracy courses or similar courses dealing with American government. Comparative Economic Systems students were matched with those taking courses emphasizing economics. In two cases the control students were on a different grade level than the experimental students. The control groups are described on Table III.

Since the Fenton Program has four types of objectives -- inquiry skills, knowledge, attitudes, and values -- four tests that purport to assess or measure these areas were used in a pre-post design. The Sequential Test of Educational Progress (STEP), published by Educational Testing Service, was used to assess change in social studies inquiry skills. The Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, published by Harcourt, Brace and World, was used to measure change in student critical thinking ability. The Survey of Interpersonal Values, published by Science Research Associates, was used to assess change in values. All three tests were given to all of the students in both the experimental and control groups.

Tests used to assess change in knowledge for the students in specific Fenton courses and in the controls were as follows: for Comparative Economic Systems, the Science Research Associates test entitled Test of Economic Understanding; for Comparative Political Systems, the Science Research Associates test entitled Principles of Democracy Test; for The Shaping of Western Society and Tradition and Change in Four Societies, the Educational Testing Service test entitled "World History," a part of the Cooperative Social Studies Test.

Assessment Results for Fenton Pilot

Student Results

The changes in student pre-test, post-test scores are listed on Table IV. A summary of the statistically significant comparisons of changes between Fenton students and controls at each grade level shows seven instances of greater positive change for Fenton students and two instances of greater positive change for the controls. Both instances of greater change for the controls occurred in the ninth grade. On one item, the "Conformity" section of the Survey of Interpersonal Values, the Fenton students showed a greater negative change. Such a change is consistent with the stated objectives of the Fenton Program. The changes at each grade level are outlined below.

TABLE III

Fenton Controls

School	Grade	Number of Teachers	Number of Students
Controls for Ninth-Grade Fenton Students Using Economic and Political Systems Courses			
Annville-Cleona High School	9	2	39
Dallastown High School	9	1	11
Controls for Tenth-Grade Fenton Students Using Shaping of Western Society and Tradition and Change in Four Societies Courses*			
Dallastown High School	10	1	9
Manheim Central High School	10	1	21
Annville-Cleona High School	11	1	10
Manheim Central High School	11	1	18
Controls for Eleventh and Twelfth-Grade Fenton Students Using Economic and Political Systems Courses*			
Columbia High School	12	1	6
South Eastern York High School	12	1	7
Northern York High School	12	1	7
Lancaster Catholic High School	12	1	7
Cedar Crest High School	12	1	6
Conestoga Valley High School	12	1	7
Dover Area High School	12	1	7

* In some cases different grade levels had to be compared when comparable course content at grade desired was not available. Appropriate grade-level tables were used in all cases.

TABLE IV

Comparison of Change Scores on Instruments Used to Assess Fenton Social Studies Pilot Program

Instrument	Fenton Change	Control Change	Comparison and Level of Significance
GRADE NINE			
STEP	+	-	Fenton over Control .01
Critical Thinking	-	+	Control over Fenton .01
Economic Understanding	+	-	Fenton over Control .01
Principles of Democracy	+	+	Control over Fenton n.s.*
Survey of Interpersonal Values			
Conformity	-	-	Fenton over Control .01**
Benevolence	-	+	Control over Fenton .01
Supportive	+	+	Fenton over Control .01
Leadership	+	-	Fenton over Control n.s.
Independence	+	+	Fenton over Control n.s.
Recognition	+	-	Fenton over Control n.s.
GRADE TEN			
STEP	+	+	Fenton over Control n.s.
Critical Thinking	+	+	Fenton over Control n.s.
World History	+	+	Fenton over Control n.s.
Survey of Interpersonal Values			
Conformity	-	-	Fenton over Control n.s.
Benevolence	-	-	Control over Fenton n.s.
Supportive	+	+	Fenton over Control n.s.
Leadership	+	-	Fenton over Control n.s.
Independence	+	+	Control over Fenton n.s.
Recognition	+	+	Control over Fenton n.s.
GRADE ELEVEN			
STEP	+	+	Fenton over Control .05
Critical Thinking	+	+	Fenton over Control n.s.
Economic Understanding	+	-	Fenton over Control .01
Principles of Democracy	+	+	Control over Fenton n.s.
Survey of Interpersonal Values			
Conformity	-	-	Fenton over Control n.s.
Benevolence	-	-	Fenton over Control n.s.
Supportive	-	-	Control over Fenton n.s.
Leadership	+	+	Fenton over Control n.s.
Independence	+	+	Fenton over Control n.s.
Recognition	+	-	Fenton over Control n.s.

* n.s. = statistically not a significant difference in change score.

** On this item the Fenton students showed a greater change in the direction of valuing "conformity" less. In terms of the objectives of the Fenton Program, this should be considered a desirable change.

Instrument	Fenton Change	Control Change	Comparison and Level of Significance
GRADE TWELVE			
STEP	-	+	Control over Fenton n.s.
Critical Thinking	-	+	Control over Fenton n.s.
Economic Understanding	+	-	Fenton over Control .01
Principles of Democracy	+	+	Fenton over Control .01
Survey of Interpersonal Values			
Conformity	-	-	Fenton over Control n.s.
Benevolence	-	-	Fenton over Control n.s.
Supportive	None	-	Control over Fenton n.s.
Leadership	+	+	Control over Fenton n.s.
Independence	+	+	Fenton over Control n.s.
Recognition	-	-	Control over Fenton n.s.

> The ninth-grade Fenton students had a significantly greater positive change (.01 level) in score on the STEP test, the *Test of Economic Understanding*, and the "Support" section of the *Survey of Interpersonal Values*. They showed a greater negative change (.01 level) on the "Conformity" section of the *Survey of Interpersonal Values*. The ninth-grade controls showed a significantly greater positive change (.01 level) on the *Critical Thinking Appraisal* and "Benevolence" section of the *Survey of Interpersonal Values*.
>
> There were no statistically significant differences between the changes in scores for the tenth grade.
>
> Eleventh-grade Fenton students showed a significantly greater change score on the STEP test (.05 level) and the *Test of Economic Understanding* (.01 level).
>
> Fenton twelfth-grade students scored significantly greater gains on the *Principles of Democracy Test* (.01 level) and the *Test of Economic Understanding* (.01 level).

An analysis of the results of each assessment instrument showed that on the STEP test the Fenton students changed more positively than the controls in grades nine, ten, and eleven and slightly less than the controls in grade twelve. In all areas measured by the STEP instrument, the Fenton Program on the whole had a positive effect. The general results of the STEP test indicate that the Fenton students in this experiment did as well as or better than the controls.

The results of the *Critical Thinking Appraisal* showed no trend in the comparison of change scores for grades ten, eleven, and twelve; but the ninth-grade control group did score significantly greater positive change in mean score than the Fenton group. This difference is explained, however, by the fact that the ninth-grade Fenton students scored significantly higher (.01 level) on the pre-test than the controls. Since the Fenton students initially scored significantly higher than the controls, they had a smaller margin for increase.

It should also be noted that this difference in pre-test scores might be attributed to the fact that the pre-tests were given up to several weeks after the start of the pilot. The results on the whole do not show that the program had any significant effect, as compared with the controls, in changing the ability of students to think critically.

On the Test of Economic Understanding the Fenton students showed statistically significant (beyond the .01 level) positive change scores over the controls at all grades (grades 9, 11, and 12). This result shows that the Fenton students' proficiency on this instrument increased more than the controls' at all grades.

The Principles of Democracy Test showed the twelfth-grade Fenton students in the Comparative Political Systems course made more positive change (.01 level) on their mean scores than the controls. This result shows that the pilot students learned more of the information that this test included.

On the Survey of Interpersonal Values significant differences in mean change scores between Fenton students and controls were recorded only at the ninth-grade level. At this grade level the Fenton students changed to value "conformity" and "benevolence" less and to value "support" more. All three changes were at the .01 level of significance. Across grade levels, non-significant trends also appeared for some of the traits. The pilot group tended to decrease their value on "conformity" and to increase their value on "support," "leadership," and "recognition." No across-grade-level trend was evident for "benevolence" and "independence." There is no assurance from the evidence that any of the changes are permanent.

Teacher Results

The Fenton teachers showed significant differences from the controls on only two measures, and even these results cancel out each other to some extent and are clouded by the fact that the in-service training emphasizing teacher-pupil classroom interaction occurred before the first classroom taping. A comparison of the pre-test of the Self-perception Inventory and the pre-tape showed that the Fenton teachers were significantly more aware of their classroom behavior than the controls (.05 level). When the changes between pre-test and post-test for the Fenton teachers were matched with the same changes in the controls, only one area showed a statistically significant difference in change scores. The Fenton teachers' discrepancy score concerning teacher lecture changed significantly less than the controls. This means that the control teachers changed more than the Fenton teachers to become more aware of how much they lectured. Since the Fenton teachers were originally more aware of their total classroom behavior, this result was not unexpected. The comparison of the pre-post changes between Fenton teachers and controls on the Self-perception Inventory and on the analysis of classroom tapes showed no significant difference.

An analysis of pre-tests and post-tests showed that the Fenton teachers tended to change to become less lecture oriented in their teaching. (Note that the pre-test was administered after the initial workshop.) The initial data showed that they were more non-directive, lectured less, and encouraged more student talk than the controls. Then during the year they changed to approach the interaction patterns of the control group. Since the first series of workshops stressed the technique of teacher-directed discussion rather than lecture and the remainder emphasized content, this result seems logical. (If permanent changes in teacher behavior and awareness are desired, it seems advisable to continue to reinforce desired classroom techniques in workshops held during the year while the pilot teachers are working in the classroom.)

On all other measures of change in perception, observed behavior, and discrepancy scores, no significant differences or trends appeared. For the Test of Interpersonal Values and the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, an analysis of change scores showed no statistically significant differences between the Fenton and the control group.

Summary

The Fenton Program prepared the students for the STEP test as well as or better than the traditional programs. It did not produce a significant difference in critical thinking. It may have produced minor changes in student values as tested on the Survey of

Interpersonal Values. An obvious strength in the Fenton curriculum appears in the area of economics since the experimental groups scored a greater change on the Test of Economic Understanding at all grade levels. At the twelfth grade, Fenton students showed a greater change on the Principles of Democracy Test. The tenth-grade materials did not produce a significant difference from the controls on the "World History" instrument.

The Fenton teachers were more aware of their teaching behavior and were less lecture oriented than the controls at the end of their initial workshop, but during the year they regressed on both points. At the time of the post-test, they were still more aware of their behavior and less lecture oriented than the controls, but the distance between them and the controls might have been maintained if teaching techniques would have been more of a concern of the workshops during the year. On other measures of change the Fenton teachers did not change significantly from pre- to post-test, and the changes that did occur were not significantly different from those of the controls.

Assessment Procedures for Elementary Pilots

The selection of pilot districts, teachers, and classes for the elementary pilots were based on a variety of priorities set by the districts of the area. The selection was not random. When the chief school administrators received information on the four elementary social studies programs, they informed SPEEDIER concerning their willingness to establish pilots. In the districts that indicated a willingness to participate, the administrator decided which programs would be piloted, determined the number of teachers and classes that would be involved, and selected the teachers. SPEEDIER recommended that at least two classes at each grade level be selected, but beyond that the individual districts made their own selection. The teachers and classes selected constituted the experimental groups.

For the elementary control groups, it was determined that two classes at each grade level would be a sufficient sample. It was also decided that all control groups must come from school districts that were not already participating in the elementary social studies experimental groups. School districts not involved were then randomly sampled. After the selection of school districts was made, two grade levels were randomly assigned to each of the eight districts sampled. This assured two classes at each grade one through eight. Then, teachers were randomly sampled at the particular grade level by using directories available for each of the four counties. Each directory listed the names of all the teachers within that county. The control groups are described on Table V.

For the students of both the experimental and the control groups, two grade-level divisions were made because the testing materials available for primary and intermediate grades were different. Grades 1-3 were placed in one group and grades 4-8 in another.

The pupils in grades 1-3 were given the Primary Social Studies Test, published by Houghton Mifflin Company. It is a non-verbal test where the teacher reads the questions and the students put marks on pictures. The second test given to the students at this level is an adaptation of the Five Faces Attitude Inventory developed by Scott and Jeffress and the Pittsburgh Public Schools Office of Education, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. It is described as a non-verbal attitude scale. Another modification of it was used as a post-test to determine attitude scores by Research for Better Schools in their Individually Prescribed Instruction (I.P.I.) program.

All of the students in the grade 4-8 group, both control and experimental, were given Form B of the Sequential Test of Educational Progress (STEP) at the appropriate grade level. Norms are available for grades 4-8 with the appropriate testing form.

Teacher inventories and procedures were the same for experimental and control groups as they were for the Fenton pilot.

TABLE V

Elementary Controls

Schools	Grade	Number of Teachers	Number of Students
Cornwall-Lebanon School District			
Ebenezer Elementary	3	1	28
South Lebanon Middle School	8	1	32
Cornwall Middle School	8	1	30
Eastern Lancaster School District			
Brecknock Elementary	1	1	25
Brecknock Elementary	6	1	21
Manheim Central School District			
H. C. Burgard Elementary	1	1	28
H. C. Burgard Elementary	2	1	30
Middletown Area School District			
L. J. Fink Elementary	5	1	23
Middletown Junior High School	7	1	26
Northern Lebanon School District			
Jonestown Elementary	6	1	21
Northern York School District			
Northern York Elementary	3	1	25
Northern York Elementary	4	1	37
Penn Manor School District			
Conestoga Elementary	2	1	21
Penn Manor Junior High School	7	1	15
Southeastern York School District			
Southeastern Elementary	4	1	22
Southeastern Elementary	5	1	26

Assessment Results for Elementary Pilots

Student Results

The comparisons of experimental group and control group change scores from pre-test to post-test are listed on Tables VI, VII, and VIII. A summary of the statistically significant results follows.

> On the Primary Social Studies Test all experimental groups showed a positive change over the pre-test, but the change was significantly greater than the controls only at grade one and this was true for only three of the four programs. At grade three, the amount of increase for the Taba students was significantly less than that of the controls.
>
> On the STEP test all experimental groups showed a positive change over the pre-test, but none of the changes were significant when compared with the controls.
>
> On the Five Faces Attitude Inventory experimental change scores were not significantly different from those of the controls.

A comparison of the change scores for each of the four pilot programs shows no significant difference between the pilot programs at any grade level on any test instrument. When each pilot group is compared with the controls, the differences that are significant are the exception rather than the rule. The only significant difference between the Taba students and the controls was on the Primary Social Studies Test at grade three where the positive change for the Taba group was significantly less than that of the controls at the .01 level. The only significant differences for Minnesota, Greater Cleveland, and Senesh students occurred at grade one. The Minnesota and Senesh level of significance was at the .05 level, and the Greater Cleveland level was .01.

TABLE VI

Comparison of Elementary Student Change Scores with Controls on the *Primary Social Studies Test*

Grade	Taba	Minnesota	Cleveland	Senesh
1	Greater	Greater*	Greater*	Greater*
2	Less	Greater	Greater	Less
3	Less**	Less	Less	Less

Notes:
All change scores were +. Listing is made with reference to elementary controls at that grade. Unless marked with an asterisk (*), the change comparisons were *not* statistically significant.

* Minnesota over Control .05 level
Cleveland over Control .01 level
Senesh over Control .05 level

** Taba less than Control .01 level

TABLE VII

Comparison of Elementary Student Change Scores with Controls on the STEP Social Studies Test

Grade	Taba	Minnesota	Cleveland
4		Greater	Greater
5	Greater	Less	Greater
6	Same		Greater
7			Greater
8			Same

Notes:

All change scores were +. Listing is made with reference to elementary controls at each grade.

None of the change comparisons were statistically significant.

TABLE VIII

Comparison of Change Scores with Controls on the Five Faces Attitude Inventory

Grade	Control	Taba	Minnesota	Cleveland	Senesh
1	+	+ greater	+ greater	+ greater	+ greater
2	+	+ less	-	+ less	+ less
3	-	- less	+	+	+

Notes:
+ or - refers to change scores, post-test to pre-test.
"Greater" or "less" compares amount of change with control.
None of the change comparisons were statistically significant.

In the first grade the elementary control groups showed the lowest mean change score on the Primary Social Studies Test. Even though the Taba first grade showed a greater mean change score, it was not enough to be statistically significant. The other three pilot groups were significantly higher than the controls. These results suggest that the Minnesota, Greater Cleveland, and Senesh students increased their level of performance because they received more of the content measured by this particular instrument.

The second grade results revealed no significant difference in mean change score on the Primary Social Studies Test and no apparent trend appeared in a comparison of the mean scores.

In the third grade the only statistically significant difference in mean change score on the Primary Social Studies Test appeared between the Taba group and the controls. The Taba group scored a smaller mean change at the .01 level. The other three programs were all lower than the controls but the difference was not statistically significant. This result might mean, that since the Taba Program is technique oriented, the students did not receive as much content as is usually included in the third grade. Another possibility is that the teachers may have been concerned more with method than content.

The Five Faces Attitude Inventory showed no significant difference in mean change scores in the first, second, or third grades. However, a non-statistical trend appeared when the mean change scores on each grade level were calculated. The change in positive attitude toward school for both experimental and controls decreased with increasing grade level.

On the STEP Social Studies Test, Form B, there were no statistically significant differences in mean change scores between any pilot group and the controls for any grade, four through eight. However, a trend was evident. At each grade the mean change scores of the pilot groups were either the same as or slightly greater than the controls. This indicates that the pilot students' change in achievement on the skills and content tested by this instrument compared favorably with the controls.

Teacher Results

Because there were too few seventh and eighth grade teachers to provide accurate results, only the teacher assessment instruments for teachers of grades one through six were analyzed. All four pilot programs were represented.

In essence, the results showed no significant changes, pre- to post-test, and no significant change score comparisons with the controls. There was no significant pre-test difference from the controls on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, the Survey of Interpersonal Values, and in observed verbal classroom behavior. There was no significant difference in change scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Survey of Interpersonal Values. Furthermore, there were no significant changes, pre- to-post-test, in self-perception of classroom behavior and discrepancy between the perception and observed behavior. This would indicate that the study had similar effects on the teachers of all four pilot programs and that there was no significant effect of the programs or the in-service workshops on the teachers in the areas assessed. It is possible that any changes that might have occurred were not measured by the instruments used.

Summary

In general, the elementary pilot programs prepared the students for the Primary Social Studies Test and the STEP test as well as or better than the traditional programs. On the Five Faces Attitude Inventory no significant differences from the controls were noted. Neither the programs nor the in-service workshops changed teacher behavior significantly nor produced any significant differences from the controls in the areas measured.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions in Terms of Purposes of the Pilots

Purpose One

Nearly all of the participating teachers, the district administrators, and the SPEEDIER staff felt the pilots led to definite improvement in social studies instruction in the participating districts. The teachers were most positive of the three groups. The elementary teachers in particular felt the pilot programs they were using were much better than their traditional social studies. A large majority of all the teachers recommended continued use of the new programs and recommended that their districts expand the pilots. However, the SPEEDIER staff feels that the "Hawthorne Effect" was a factor in teacher reaction to all five pilots. A more valid reaction is anticipated after the teachers use the programs for a second year.

Outside social studies experts who worked with the teachers also felt that the pilots were valuable in improving social studies instruction. Their limited knowledge of the instruction traditionally pursued in the area, however, limits the value of their assessment.

Purpose Two

The teachers, administrators, SPEEDIER staff, and outside social studies experts who have worked with the pilots all felt that teacher classroom behavior was modified positively by the pilot experience. The assessment procedures used also reinforced this conclusion for the Fenton pilot. It must be pointed out, however, that the most significant change in teacher classroom behavior occurred immediately after the initial workshop. In most cases, when the performance of teachers was matched with their perception of their classroom behavior and with the type of classroom behavior expected of the new programs they were using, the teachers regressed during the year.

It seems clear that if teacher classroom behavior is to be modified permanently, in-service workshops must continue to reinforce the expected change in behavior during the school year and specific training should be devoted to mastering new teaching strategies and techniques. The use of new social studies programs alone without emphasis on changed teaching strategies and techniques will not assure a permanent change in teacher behavior.

Purpose Three

All of the teachers and administrators who worked directly with the new pilots came in contact with new social studies content, ideas, and teaching approaches. Only a few of the participating districts and teachers had known anything about the five social studies pilot programs before they were approached by SPEEDIER. Other educators in the area who visited the pilot teachers, who participated in shorter-term in-service workshops and information sessions conducted by SPEEDIER, and who received printed information about the pilots also gained in their understanding of the new social studies. A multiplier effect is expected in this dissemination of new social studies information each year.

Purpose Four

The participating teachers did develop new teaching skills. As was pointed out earlier, however, evidence that they mastered these new skills to a degree that would assure their permanent use was not demonstrated. As a result, modifications in the pilot model, which include heavier emphasis on and practice in the use of new teaching strategies, have been planned for 1969-1970.

Purpose Five

At the beginning of the five social studies pilots the common procedure for changing the social studies curriculum in the districts served by SPEEDIER was the selection of a new social studies textbook series. In most cases none of the available materials were analyzed by the committees appointed to make the selections, and there were usually no recognized criteria used in the selection process. Curriculum change was generally viewed as a single step adoption because old books had worn out. Although lip service was paid to the idea that curriculum change should be a continuous and evolving process, it was not carried out in practice. Teacher in-service workshops were not seen as part of the change process.

The use of the pilot model seems to have changed the perceptions of many educators on these points. There is considerable evidence that actual practice in curriculum revision is being modified. The extent of the impact and the permanence of its effect can only be determined after a longer period of time.

Purpose Six

A positive attitude toward curriculum experimentation and change on the part of participating teachers and administrators seems apparent. During the course of the pilots, nearly all teachers indicated that the amount of work involved was more than expected and nearly all administrators expressed apprehension about the cost, particularly the monies for in-service training of teachers. By the end of the school year, nearly all members of both groups felt the pilot efforts were worthwhile, and they indicated an intention to continue the experimentation.

Purpose Seven

All of the educators of the area who participated with the pilots received new insights concerning social studies and curriculum change. This is particularly true of the teachers who were involved directly, since many of them traditionally had played little or no role in the process of curriculum change. At this point, it seems that these people are better prepared to improve the curriculum of their own school systems, but consultant aid from SPEEDIER and other outside experts seems to be necessary for the near future.

Purpose Eight

Many of the districts that participated in the pilot have modified procedures and policies for handling and promoting curriculum change. The inclusion of significant in-service teacher training as part of curriculum revision, and the view that curriculum revision is a continuous process, are probably the two most significant changes. In addition, many districts began for the first time to make budgetary provisions for the payment of teachers to work in curriculum revision or for the provision of substitute teachers to free them to participate.

Conclusions about the General Assumptions of the Pilots

None of the thirteen assumptions upon which the pilots were based were refuted by the experiences of 1968-1969. However, three of the assumptions should be restated in light of the year's experiences and one additional assumption should be added to the list. The changes should be as follows:

Assumption five originally read:

> One- or two-day in-service programs would be similarly ineffective.
>
> It should be restated to read:
>
> Short term in-service programs that do not tie directly into classroom activities of the teachers involved would be similarly ineffective.

Assumption seven originally read:

> These materials can be used as vehicles for up-dating social studies curriculum contents, teaching strategies, and administrative procedures.
>
> It should be restated to read:
>
> These materials can be used as vehicles for up-dating social studies curriculum contents, teaching strategies, and administrative procedures where the desired changes are identified and in-service programs are directed toward the producing of these changes. The materials alone will not produce the most effective change.

Assumption ten originally read:

> By piloting the programs in their own schools, local teachers and administrators will be able to make a valid assessment of the programs in terms of their own priorities.
>
> It should be restated to read:
>
> By piloting the programs in their own schools, local teachers and administrators will be able to make a valid assessment of the programs in terms of their own priorities. If the districts do not have clearly established priorities, the pilot will provide information that can be used to set the priorities. However, if the assessment is to be valid, the possibility of a strong "Hawthorne Effect" concerning the new program should be taken into consideration.

A Fourteenth Assumption should be added:

14. New social studies programs do not serve as efficient vehicles for changing teacher behavior unless the specific desired behavior changes are determined and workshop sessions are provided to instruct the pilot teachers in the desired teaching strategies.

Conclusions Concerning the Pilot Model:

On the basis of one year's experience the model seems to be effective. The five phases seem to represent five different steps in the process of producing effective curriculum change in social studies in the four counties served by SPEEDIER. It should be noted, however, that the amount of time and effort placed on each one of the five phases often varies according to the district and the people involved. For instance, some situations require a rather extensive "Climatizing" stage while others permit initiating a pilot rather quickly.

Factors that affect the amount of time and effort necessary for climatizing are the perceptions of the educators concerning curriculum revision and the degree to which they are satisified with their current program. It appears that one "innovator" within a district can produce a significant change if his colleagues are not negative toward change. If, however, one strategically placed person is committed to the status quo, the possibility of producing significant change within one year is severely limited.

The selection of programs for piloting in Phase II of the pilot requires an unexpected degree of caution. Under the original conception of Phase II, SPEEDIER would present to districts information about a variety of programs that the staff felt would be possible improvements for the districts. These were to be presented as alternatives from which each district would select the particular program or programs that seemed to be most valuable and appropriate for it. However, many of the district administrators and teachers did not feel confident to make a selection and often indicated that they were willing to work with any program that SPEEDIER would suggest. This reaction indicated to the SPEEDIER staff that the recommendations to the district should be more thoroughly studied than had been anticipated and should be more specific. It also pointed out that the pilot should incorporate instruction in a process of program selection for teachers and administrators.

The Pilot Implementation Stage of Phase III, in which the pilot is used in the classroom under the observation and with the consultation of SPEEDIER staff members, is the most critical part of the entire pilot. The implementation staff member assigned to each pilot must be able (1) to see that the teacher is implementing the program effectively, (2) to provide support for the teacher, (3) to provide direction so that the implementation process and the use of the program are not distorted, (4) to determine the type of advice and assistance that is needed, and (5) to secure the assistance in a very short period of time. At the same time, he must be able to use his contact with the teacher and observation in the classroom to determine the direction and pace of the entire pilot.

Within the Pilot Implementation Stage, the segment that emphasizes refinement of teaching techniques is most difficult. It is in this task that all of the skills of the Implementation Director are needed. He must be able to provide support, direction, instruction in new techniques, and constructive criticism.

The Critical Evaluation part of Phase III was not pursued in as much depth as was originally expected. The SPEEDIER staff decided near the end of the school year that the degree of sophistication of the participants and the amount of work already invested in the pilots by many of the teachers made the postponement of a rather thorough critical evaluation advisable.

None of the districts working with SPEEDIER functioned in Phase IV during 1968-1969. It does appear, however, that much work in Phase IV must be devoted to the development of instructional leadership skills in the administrators in each district if the transfer of responsibility for curriculum experimentation and change is to be shifted from SPEEDIER to district personnel.

Several districts moved into Phase V at the end of 1968-1969 by adopting the pilot program they used during the year. SPEEDIER did not encourage such a move since the pilots were limited to the trial of one or two programs by few teachers. SPEEDIER staff members feel that to some extent this rather quick step resulted from dissatisfaction with the traditional social studies program used in the districts, but they also believe that it might be part of the older perception of curriculum revision which looks upon the entire process as a one-step change from something old to something new. Because of these factors and because the "Hawthorne Effect" appeared to be present, SPEEDIER found it necessary to caution districts that the programs they had been piloting are only a few (in many cases only one) of many new social studies programs and that other programs not used during the first year of the pilot might prove even more satisfactory to each district.

With the changes in emphasis described above, the pilot model is now being used for a second year. Reports of the effectiveness of the model as revised will be reported during 1970. A preliminary report for 1969-1970 will be available in the spring and a second-year report on pilot operations will be available after the conclusion of the 1969-1970 operational year in July.

Conclusions Concerning the Five Pilot Programs

Fenton Program

The Fenton Program served as an effective vehicle for change in terms of the purposes established for the social studies pilots. In general, the participating teachers and administrators of the districts in which it was used felt it was a significant improvement over their traditional social studies programs. The use of the program did require adjustments in teacher strategies, district policies, and student performance. The teachers felt that the program as a whole taught more significant information and skills then their traditional programs, but they said the lessons had to be revised and used flexibly or they became boring. Students who were highly conscious of grades often commented that they felt more secure with more factual learning. In one district where the Fenton students moved into an eleventh-grade research-oriented American history course in the 1969-1970 school year, the teacher noticed a significant improvement over past years in the ability of the students to analyze historical information. Thirteen of the fifteen pilot teachers are continuing with the program for 1969-1970.

The research studies conducted during the pilot show that the program was as effective in teaching social studies information as the traditional social studies. The students who participated in Comparative Economic Systems did significantly better than the controls. There was no significant difference in critical thinking or in over-all changes of values between the Fenton students and the controls.

Taba Program

The Taba Program was effective in producing change in terms of the pilot purposes. All the participating teachers and administrators felt it was a significant improvement over their traditional social studies. The use of the program did require changes in teaching strategies, district policies, and student performance. According to teacher and SPEEDIER staff opinion, it was very effective in producing change in teacher classroom behavior, although the teacher assessment instruments did not reinforce the opinion.

Participating teachers and administrators of the districts in which it was used were unanimous in their support of the program. Every teacher is continuing with the program and it has the largest increase in participants for 1969-1970 of all the pilots. Two schools within the area and two other districts outside the four counties served by SPEEDIER are presently engaged in using the program with all teachers in a single school. There are indications that several districts are moving toward district-wide adoption. Generally, the test instruments do not show significant differences between the Taba students and the controls.

Minnesota Program

The Minnesota Program seems to be an effective vehicle for producing the changes outlined in the pilot purposes. Most of the participating teachers and their administrators felt it was an improvement over their traditional social studies. The use of the program has enabled teachers to expand the content they taught and become much more flexible in their teaching, but change in teacher classroom interaction was only slightly evident. SPEEDIER attributes this small degree of change in teacher behavior to the way in which the Minnesota Program was piloted rather than to the program itself. It believes that if the specific teaching strategies to be used with the program are identified as part of the pilot and in-service training of teachers is directed toward producing these changes, the program will be a very effective vehicle for changing teacher behavior.

A majority of the teachers and districts that used the Minnesota Program recommended that it be continued in their district. Two districts chose to expand the pilot, one of which is using it district-wide in grades K-3 for 1969-1970 and will expand it to include all elementary grades in 1970-1971. On the testing instruments, there was no significant difference between the performance of the Minnesota students as compared with the controls.

Greater Cleveland Program

The Greater Cleveland Program served effectively as a vehicle for change in terms of the pilot purposes. All participating teachers and their administrators felt it to be an improvement over their traditional social studies. It enabled the teachers to expand the content they covered, but it did not produce a significantly greater degree of flexible teaching. Like the Minnesota Program, it did not produce significant changes in teacher behavior. Here, also, it appears that changes in teacher behavior require more specific and thorough pilot training sessions.

All of the participating teachers and districts recommended continuation of the program. Several districts expanded its use for 1969-1970. One district added all its first and second grade teachers, and another involved all its primary grades and will expand it to other elementary grade levels in 1970-1971. Results of the assessment instruments for the program show no significant difference between the performance of the students in the Greater Cleveland Program and the controls.

Senesh Program

Because of a series of administrative problems within some of the pilot districts and the reluctance of some teachers to have their classroom performance observed by an outside consultant, the Senesh Program was not given as thorough a trial as had been hoped. It does appear, however, that the Senesh Program is an effective vehicle for change in terms of the pilot purposes. As in the case of the Minnesota and Greater Cleveland Programs, the program without specifically determined instruction in particular teaching strategies does not produce significant changes in teaching behavior. Where the program was given a valid trial, the teachers and district administrators recommended its continuation and expansion. Most of the expansion, however, was done without direct SPEEDIER involvement because the people involved felt that it could be accomplished by the districts without consultation assistance. Results of the assessment on student performance indicate no significant difference between the Senesh students and the controls.

SPEEDIER PROJECT

research
planning
implementation

101 WEST CHERRY STREET
PALMYRA, PENNSYLVANIA 17078

PHONE 717 838-9611